DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 366 308 IR 016 504

AUTHOR Beaudin, Bart P.; Quick, Don
TITLE Instructional Video Evaluation.
INSTITUTION Colorado State Univ., Ft. Collins. School of Occupational and Educational Studies.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. for Occupational Safety and Health (DHHS/PHS), Cincinnati, OH.
REPORT NO AEP-93-05
PUB DATE 1 Nov 93
CONTRACT U07-CCU807121-02
NOTE 16p.
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Audiovisual Aids; Evaluation Methods; *Instructional Material Evaluation; Instructional Materials; *Integrated Activities; *Interactive Video; Planning; Test Construction; Videodisks; *Videotape Recordings

ABSTRACT

In order to meet the needs of the High Plains Intermountain Center for Agricultural Health and Safety, research was conducted to develop product evaluation methods for instructional videos. Compiling suggestions from the literature and synthesizing the instructional design methodology of several researchers, an instrument was developed to help a reviewer evaluate a video for its instructional quality. The following quality indicators are discussed: (1) content, including accuracy, usefulness, and bias; (2) instructional plan, considering objectives, presentation, application, learner reflection and interaction, and integration into the learning environment; (3) technical production, including design, content focus, visual quality, audio quality, and audio-visual relationship; and (4) supplemental materials, including introductory materials and content summaries. Two tables provide a sample compilation of data from the instrument and a data compilation form. An appendix contains the instrument itself. (Contains 17 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Colorado State University
Fort Collins, CO

School of Occupational and Educational Studies
Adult Education Program
Bart P. Beaudin, Ph.D., Program Chair
Report No. AEP-93-05

College of Applied Human Sciences

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 366 308

Instructional Video Evaluation

Bart P. Beaudin
Associate Professor
Colorado State University

Don Quick
Research Associate
Colorado State University

November 1, 1993

This research has been made possible through a grant from the:
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Public Health Service
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health
Contact Number UO7-CCU807121-02

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Bart P. Beaudin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR016384

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Permission is hereby granted to end users to duplicate this instrument for use in evaluating videos with appropriate credit given to:

High Plains Intermountain Center for Agricultural Health and Safety (HI-CAHS)
Institute of Rural Environmental Health
Education & Training Program
Bart P. Beaudin, Ph.D., Team Leader
110 Veterinary Science Building
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, CO 80523

If you have suggestions that may be of interest to the authors, please drop them a note at:

Adult Education Program
School of Occupational and Educational Studies
College of Applied Human Sciences
#26 Education Building
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, Colorado 80523

This research has been made possible through a grant from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. A special thanks is extended to Scott C. Becker and Evelyn S. Grace for their contributions to this project.

Table of Contents

Instructional Video Evaluation 1
The Need for Instructional Video Evaluation 1
Instructional Video Evaluation Instrument 1

Instructional Video Quality Indicator Descriptions 2
Content 2
#1: Accuracy 2
#2: Usefulness 2
#3: Bias-Free 2
Instructional Plan 2
#4: State the objectives 3
#5: Content presentation 3
#6: Learner application 3
#7: Learner reflection 3
#8: Meet the objectives 3
#9: Learner Interaction 3
#10: Integration into the learning environment 4
Technical Production 4
#11: General video design characteristics 4
#12: Focus on the intended content 4
#13: Visual quality 4
#14: Audio quality 5
#15: Audio-visual relationship 5
Supplemental Materials 5
#16: Provide introductory information 6
#17: Clarify and summarize content 6

How to Use the Instructional Video Evaluation Instrument 6
Table 1 - Sample Compilation of Data Derived from the Instrument 7
Table 2 - Blank Compilation Table 8

References 9

Appendix A - Instructional Video Evaluation Instrument 10

Instructional Video Evaluation

The advisory committee for the **High Plains Intermountain Center for Agricultural Heath and Safety** (HI-CAHS) strongly recommended videos be used in the education programs developed by the HI-CAHS Education and Training Program. In keeping with this mandate, HI-CAHS has identified several videos that are being considered for training programs. A major problem arose in how to evaluate these videos for instructional content, thus the need for this research.

The Need for Instructional Video Evaluation

For this project, videos are considered "products." Product evaluation methods are needed to help users and producers arrive at better decisions based on reliable, accurate, and complete information (Krink & Gustafson, 1986). From idea inception through final product and beyond, evaluation needs to be incorporated into the production and viewing process. Formative and summative evaluation should "have a place all through the production process: before, during and after" (Hausman, 1990, p. 124). Evaluation is needed to provide the industry with more direction about what constitutes effective, high-quality educational products:

> Until evaluation becomes an integral part of the video design and production process, there will be no experienced-based knowledge of what video approaches work, with what type of audiences, under what kinds of conditions, and in what type of content areas. (Sneed, 1991, p. 8)

Evaluation of products, including formative and summative procedures, is an important aspect of production, with the aim of "making administrative decisions and decisions about course improvement" (Krink & Gustafson, 1986, p. 217).

The lack of quality evaluation techniques, the emphasize on the negative, and too many variables to measure are barriers to evaluation reaching its intended goals. The lack of quality evaluation techniques is partly responsible for the misconception about what evaluation is and how to achieve it. In the real world, it is impossible to "isolate the effects of a video program on a particular outcome, like increased sales or improved job performance" (Sneed, 1991, p. 5). From its formative and summative roots in the design and production process, evaluation can be accomplished by the organizer of the learning event and the end user to decide whether a tape is suitable for their particular instructional program. The instructional video product "should be a realization that there is a need for moving visual material of this type in a particular instructional situation either in a supporting role or as the main vehicle of instruction and that no suitable material is already available" (Ellington, 1985, p.176).

Instructional Video Evaluation Instrument

Compiling the suggestions for quality indicators for videos found in books, articles, and forms by various authors (Dube, 1980; Ellington, 1985; Handbook of Forms, 1985; Hunter, 1990; Hutton, 1984; Krink & Gustafson, 1986; National Career Development Association [NCDA], 1992; Pett, 1989) and synthesizing the instructional design methodology of Brookfield (1985, 1986), Friere (1970), Galbraith (1991, 1992), and Seels & Glasgow (1990), an instrument was developed to aid the reviewer in evaluating a video for its instructional quality (see Appendix A). The following is a list of the quality indicators

used in the instrument, with detailed information concerning why it was included and how to judge the video for each indicator.

Instructional Video Quality Indicator Descriptions

Content

The content of the video is a prime concern in an instructional setting. The video must be accurate, useful, and free from bias.

Quality indicator #1: Accuracy. If the content of the video is not correct and up-to-date then the video is not ideally useable for learning. The content must be accurate and current (NCDA, 1992). The video must portray situations that are current and useful in today's world. There may be portions that are usable and portions that should not be included. The criteria for establishing what should not be included is dependent on what impact the inaccurate information will have on the learner.

Quality indicator #2: Usefulness. The content of the video must be generally useful. The video should stimulate, motivate and inform the learner to act on the information that is being presented. Ideally, learners should consider and/or incorporate the ideas presented (Krink & Gustafson, 1986; NCDA, 1992).

Quality indicator #3: Bias-Free. The video should be bias-free, including stereotyping because of age, gender, ethnicity, race, physical impairment, values, dress, language, or social class (Krink & Gustafson, 1986; NCDA, 1992). If the video is not free from bias, the educational objectives may be greatly effected or compromised. Individuals depicted in the video should not be shown as a role stereotype for the task being enacted or illustrated. "A video lacking a progressive social orientation would also be deficient in objectivity and accuracy of information" (NCDA, 1992, p. 6).

Instructional Plan

Instructional design models are used to control the design process. These models generically include five steps: *analysis, design, development, implementation, and evaluation.* During the *analysis* step the instructional designer might perform a needs assessment and create a problem statement. The *design* entails creating a plan of operation that would guide the designer in setting competencies and outcomes, writing objectives, creating assessment strategies and a selection of the proper media (videotapes, texts, facilitation aids, etc.). *Development* means turning that plan into reality, creating the necessary session plans, study guides, workbooks, job aids, etc. that are needed for delivering the instructional program. When the program is ready it is *implemented* on a trail basis and *evaluated* so improvements can be made (Seals & Glasgow, 1990).

The concern with the selection of the proper video to use in a learning activity is with this *design* phase. During the design, a plan must be established that results in the learners' needs being accomplished through the use of the video. This plan can be generically outlined as having an introduction, a body, and closure. The introduction should include the objectives of the session, benefits that will be derived from the session and some sort of

"attention getter." The main body should have a presentation of the content, some demonstration or application of this content. It should also allow time for learner reflection on the content and application. Continue this, presentation→application→reflection cycle, until all the objectives expressed in the introduction are met (Brookfield, 1985, 1986; Friere, 1970; Galbraith, 1991, 1992). Closure should review what has been learned during the session and motivate the learner to apply the content to their lives. The following quality indicators are organized around this structure and are considered important when evaluating a video's worth for instructional purposes.

Quality indicator #4: State the objectives. It is important to begin the video with a motivating introduction to stimulate interest and to meet the expectations of the learner. People remember the first things presented in a program, so it is important to include the key learning elements in the introduction (Pett, 1989; Krink & Gustafson, 1986; NCDA, 1992). The introduction should emphasize a description of the objectives or key elements contained in the video.

Quality indicator #5: Content presentation. The content should be controlled to promote understanding. The video should simplify complex tasks and avoid introducing extraneous information. It should not attempt to introduce too much material or introduce too much detail. Do not clutter the scene (Dube, 1980; Krink & Gustafson, 1986). "Divide complex ideas into simple ones and avoid introducing extraneous information, unwanted sounds, or inappropriate pauses" (Pett, 1989, p. 2). "The very nature of video programming is superficial and simplistic" (Hunter, 1986, p. 20). "If you try to cover too much material or introduce too much detail, some of your audience may become confused or 'get lost'" (Ellington, 1985, p. 175).

Quality indicator #6: Learner application. The video should suggest methods for learner application of the newly acquired knowledge. Recommendations for practice of what is being discussed should be specified. Practice can be designed into the general program design or into the video itself (Dube, 1980; Pett, 1989). "A collaborative and critically reflective learning experience must be a combination of contemplation and action" (Galbraith, 1991, p. 4).

Quality indicator #7: Learner reflection. The video should suggest methods for reflection on the content and application. Reflection, silence, or time should be allowed for the learner to react to a scene or statement (Dube, 1980; Pett, 1989). It is also important for the facilitator to interact with the learner to provide response to the learner's application of the material. There should be "alternating and continuous engagements by teachers and learners in exploration, action, and reflection" (Brookfield, 1986, p. 15).

Quality indicator #8: Meet the objectives. The video should meet the learning objectives and needs of the learner. What is being visually depicted should fit the learning objectives (Dube, 1980; Krink & Gustafson, 1986; National Career Development Association [NCDA], 1992). As in the introduction, people also remember the last things presented in a program, therefore, it is important to have the key learning elements in the summary or conclusion (Pett, 1989).

Quality indicator #9: Learner Interaction. The video should be conducive to learner interaction. Videos can often be used to promote active learning. Video-student

interaction can be designed into the overall program design. The video does not need to be a one-way communication, screen to the student; it can be produced to interact with the learner (Dube, 1980; Hunter, 1986; Krink & Gustafson, 1986).

Quality indicator #10: Integration into the learning environment. Videos can be used to add emphasis and supplement more traditional methods. The video is an excellent media for bringing "experiences and places into the classroom" (Dube, 1980, p. 28).

Technical Production

The following quality indicators are derived from good design practices of the producers of video products for instruction. The video industry is charged with producing materials that give quality methods to the instructional process. Characteristics that are inherent to the medium are: (1) products foster unification and involvement between the viewer and the subject matter of the video; (2) video viewing provides one-way communication along with transcending space and time; (3) the viewer is enveloped with sound along with visual perspectives; (4) video viewing involves all of the senses simultaneously; and (5), video demands participation from the viewer (Dube, 1980). Hunter (1990) identifies specific characteristics of a quality video product as transcendence, attention manipulation, detail, special effects, economy, independence and interdependence.

Quality indicator #11: General video design characteristics. Videos are conducive to providing well planned, structured, and organized instructional design (Dube, 1980; Ellington, 1985; Krink & Gustafson, 1986; NCDA, 1992; Pett, 1989). The video should not appear to be a video; it should appear real. The technology should become transparent and non threatening to the learner (Hutton, 1984). Transcendence refers to a video's ability to move back and forth and in and out of time and space. The video camera can enter a world that the learner cannot and allows the learner to "confront otherwise nebulous theories" (Hunter, 1990, p.18). The camera can go where the learner cannot, however, care must be taken to prevent presenting a false idea of reality (Hunter, 1990).

Quality indicator #12: Focus on the intended content. The video should avoid content not related to the subject matter stated in the introduction or implied in the title. Digressions could lead to confusion and would be a waste of video time. The video should stay focused on the content and logically flow (Ellington, 1985; NCDA, 1992). In designing a learning program, it is important that the main points be repeated several times so that they are not missed (Krink & Gustafson, 1986; Pett, 1989). Accomplish this through examples, illustrations, and questions (Krink & Gustafson, 1986). "The length of the video should be weighed in balance with the content, intended audience" (NCDA, 1992, p. 4) and instructional value.

Quality indicator #13: Visual quality. Make the angle at which the camera is viewing the scene or training environment appropriate to what is being learned. Is the camera looking at the scene from the learner's point of view, in situations where the learner would benefit from that point of view? This is especially important when psychomotor skills are being taught (Dube, 1986).

Was the speed suitable for the audience or subject matter? Some learners prefer the scenes to change quickly, while others prefer a slower pace (Dube, 1986). Varying types of

camera shots, close-ups to long shots, also provide variety in the video (Ellington, 1985; Pett, 1989).

There are a variety of special electronic procedures and effects that can alter a video beyond presenting just what a camera records. These effects include: "pop-on arrows, dissolves that intimate time distortion, slow and fast motion, animation, art work, split screen, captions and cartoon characters" (Hunter, 1990, p. 19). Special effects accomplish a variety of things. They add impact, meaning and brilliance to instructional material along with allowing for concrete topics, to be presented side-by-side for comparison and contrast. Hunter goes on to suggest that special effects enhance a learner's processing skills and improve video products. Using special effects can prompt learners to give unusual attention to specific details, ask questions and draw conclusions from instructional materials. Graphics, animation and special electronic transitions between scenes help learners understand video materials and conceptualize otherwise unclear concepts.

Quality indicator #14: Audio quality. The narration should consist of words that are familiar to the audience. It should be informal, suitable, easily understood and free of stereotyping (Krink & Gustafson, 1986; NCDA, 1992; Pett, 1989). Although there may not be any difference in learning with respect to the speed of the narration, it is better to err on the slow side (Dube, 1980). In any case, the speed should be appropriate for the subject matter (Dube, 1980; Krink & Gustafson, 1986; Pett, 1989).

The background music should be fitting for the visual affect or audio narration. "Music may distract the students from what they are trying to learn" (Dube, 1980, p. 25). Use music appropriately for affective learning (Pett, 1989; NCDA, 1992). Use of background noises can be conducive to learning, such as farm noises in an agricultural safety video. Sound effects will add emphasis to the visual tract of a video to enhance learning (Pett, 1989; NCDA, 1992).

Quality indicator #15: Audio-visual relationship. A well-combined audio-visual program is best for learning. It is good to name items that are being seen in the visual tract. Visually showing the audio's key words and announcing the visual's main points places emphasis where it needs to be, in key areas (Dube, 1980; Pett, 1989). Remember, videos are essentially a visual media, thus the audio track plays a supportive role (Ellington, 1985). The audio and visual component should never contradict each other and should flow together. The two modes should compliment each other (Pett, 1989), having a variety of sounds and visuals attract and hold attention (Pett, 1989).

Supplemental Materials

The information that accompanies a video is important in the instructional design of the product. It must be accurate and useful to the learner and the facilitator. It must state the purpose of the video, give a summary of the content of the video, clarify any terms or procedures that may not be clear from the video, and provide the learner and facilitator with a guide to using the video (NCDA, 1992).

Video is not a "magic bullet" (Hart, 1984, p. 87). For the product to be of high quality and effective, a program can require considerable facilitation and hard-copy support

materials. "Programs that achieve the most successful educational results are known to have supplemental materials that correspond to the [video] telecast" (Hunter, 1990, p. 20).

Quality indicator #16: Provide introductory information. Before watching the video, the learner should be aware of the purpose and objectives of the video. The video should accomplish what is stated in the supplemental materials and shared with the learner. The credit information (date of production, revision, producer, title, etc.) in the video should match what is in the supplemental materials (NCDA, 1992).

Quality indicator #17: Clarify and summarize content. This may consist of providing job aids or diagrams that help in understanding the material. It may mean defining terms and giving other sources for further investigation. The summary should be useful in understanding what the video contains and should match what is on the medium. The supplemental materials should also contain aids in following the video for learning, such as scripts, reproductions of important content, and stop-and-discuss points. There should be suggested activities in the materials to aid in understanding, such as discussion questions, role plays or simulation exercises (NCDA, 1992).

How to Use the Instructional Video Evaluation Instrument

The main purpose of the evaluation instrument is to allow reviewers to establish baseline information related to a video before a decision is made to recommend the product for inclusion in a learning event. The Instrument can be copied and distributed to several subject matter experts, instructors and/or end users for independent review of the video. Compile the results (see the Table 1 below for an example and Table 2 is a blank for your convenience). Each quality indicator is normally weighted the same, however, an evaluation coordinator could adjust the weight of one or more indicators to add emphasis. With this information, the value of the video for instructional purposes can then be quantified.

Table 1 - Sample Compilation of Data Derived from the Instrument

Quality Indicators	Reviewer One	Reviewer Two	Reviewer Three	Total (Mean)
1. Accurate	5	4	4	13(4.3)
2. Useful	4	4	3	11(3.7)
3. Bias-Free	3	4	4	11(3.7)
Content Sub-Total	**12(4.0)**	**12(4.0)**	**11(3.7)**	**35(3.9)**
4. Objectives	4	5	4	13(4.3)
5. Presentation	3	4	5	12(4.0)
6. Application	3	3	3	9(3.0)
7. Reflection	3	2	3	8(2.7)
8. Met Objectives	4	5	3	12(4.0)
9. Interaction	3	4	3	10(3.3)
10. Integration	4	4	4	12(4.0)
Instructional Sub-Total	**24(3.4)**	**27(3.8)**	**25(3.5)**	**76(3.6)**
11. Design	5	5	5	15(5.0)
12. Focused	4	5	4	13(4.3)
13. Visual	3	4	4	11(3.7)
14. Audio	4	4	4	12(4.0)
15. Audio-Visual	4	3	4	11(3.7)
Technical Sub-Total	**20(4.0)**	**21(4.2)**	**21(4.2)**	**62(4.1)**
16. Intro Info	4	5	4	13(4.3)
17. Summary	3	3	3	9(3.0)
Supplemental Sub-Total	**7(3.5)**	**8(4.0)**	**7(3.5)**	**22(3.7)**
Quality Total(Mean)	**63(3.7)**	**68(4.0)**	**64(3.8)**	**195(3.8)**

Table 2 - Blank Compilation Table

Quality Indicators	Reviewer One	Reviewer Two	Reviewer Three	Total (Mean)
1. Accurate				
2. Useful				
3. Bias-Free				
Content Sub-Total				
4. Objectives				
5. Presentation				
6. Application				
7. Reflection				
8. Met Objectives				
9. Interaction				
10. Integration				
Instructional Sub-Total				
11. Design				
12. Focused				
13. Visual				
14. Audio				
15. Audio-Visual				
Technical Sub-Total				
16. Intro Info				
17. Summary				
Supplemental Sub-Total				
Quality Total(Mean)				

Copyright © 1993 Permission is hereby granted to end users to duplicate this table for use in evaluating videos with appropriate credit given to High Plains Intermountain Center for Agricultural Health and Safety (HI-CAHS), Education & Training Program, Bart Beaudin, Ph.D., Team Leader, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado.

References

Brookfield, S. D. (1985). A critical definition of adult education. *Adult Education Quarterly. 36*, 44-49.

Brookfield, S. D. (1986). *Understanding and facilitating adult learning.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dube, C. (1980). A study in instructional television. *Performance and Instruction. 24*(5), (pp. 24-29).

Ellington, H. (1985). *Producing teaching materials*. New York: Nichols.

Friere, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). New York: Herder and Herder. (Original work published 1968).

Galbraith, M. W. (1991). The adult learning transactional process. In M. W. Galbraith (Ed.), *Facilitating adult learning: A transactional process* (pp. 1-32). Malabar, FL: Krieger.

Galbraith, M. W. (1992). Nine principles of good facilitation. *Adult Learning. 3*(6), 10- 11, 20.

Handbook of Forms. (1985). Irving, TX: International Television Association.

Hart, I. (1984). Video and the control of knowledge. In O. Zuber Skerritt (Ed.), *Video In Higher Education.* London: Kogan Page.

Hausman, C. (1990). *Institutional Video: Planning, Budgeting, Production and Evaluation.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Hunter, P.E. (1990). A designer's guide to scriptwriting: Video capabilities and limitations. *Performance and Instruction. 29*(3), 18-22.

Hutton, D. (1984). Video technology in higher education: State of the art? In O. Zuber Skerritt (Ed.), *Video In Higher Education.* London: Kogan Page.

Krink, F. G., & Gustafson K.L. (1986). *Instructional technology: A systematic approach to education.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

National Career Development Association [NCDA]. (1992). *Guidelines for the preparation and evaluation of video career media.* Alexandria, VA: Author.

Pett, D.W. (1989). Design of the audio track for slide sets and filmstrips. *Performance and Instruction. 28*(9), 1-4.

Seels, B. & Glasgow, Z. (1990). *Exercises in instructional design.* Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Sneed, L. (1991). *Evaluating Video Programs: Is It Worth It?.* White Plains, NY: Knowledge Industry.

Appendix A - Instructional Video Evaluation Instrument

Instructional Video Evaluation Instrument

Video Title:_____

Name of Evaluator:_____

Phone:_____ Date Viewed:_____

Please rate the video according to the following quality indicators by CIRCLING one response for each item. (A detailed discussion of each item is located in the information packet, *Instructional Video Evaluation*):

Poor → Exceptional

Content

1 2 3 4 5 **1. Accurate**
Was the content of the video accurate and up-to-date? If not, then the video is not ideally suitable for learning. There may be portions of the content that should NOT be used, as well as sections that are usable. Please note unusable content in the space provided or on a separate attachment.
Comments: _____

1 2 3 4 5 **2. Useful**
Was the content of the video generally useful? The video should stimulate, motivate and inform the learner to act on the information that was being presented. Will you incorporate the ideas presented into your life?
Comments: _____

1 2 3 4 5 **3. Bias-Free**
Was the video bias-free, including stereotyping with regard to age, sex, ethnicity, race, physical impairment, values, dress, language, or social class?
Comments: _____

Instructional Plan

1 2 3 4 5 **4. Stated the Objectives**
Did the video begin with a motivating introduction to stimulate interest? Were the objectives or key elements made clear in the introduction?
Comments: _____

1 2 3 4 5 **5. Content Presentation**
Was the content detail controlled to promote understanding? Did the video simplify complex tasks and avoid introducing extraneous information? Did it try to cover too much material or introduce too much detail?
Comments: _____

1 2 3 4 5 **6. Learner Application**
Did the video suggest methods for the learner to apply the newly acquired knowledge? Were suggestions for practice of what's being discussed considered? Practice can be designed into the overall program design as well as into the video itself.
Comments: _____

1 2 3 4 5 **7. Learner Reflection**
Did the video allow for learner reflection? Was reflection, silence, or time allowed for the learners to react to a scene or statement? It is also important for the facilitator to interact with the student to provide feedback on the learner's application of the material.
Comments: _____

1 2 3 4 5 **8. Met the Objectives**
Did the video meet the learning objectives and needs of the learner? Did what was being visually depicted fit the learning objectives? As in the introduction, people also remember the last things that are presented in a program, therefore, did the video have the key learning elements repeated in the summary or conclusion.
Comments: _____

1 2 3 4 5 **9. Learner Interaction**
Was the video conducive to learner interaction? Videos can often be used to promote active learning.
Comments: _____

Copyright © 1993 by High Plains Intermountain Center for Agricultural Health and Safety (HI-CAHS)
Permission is hereby granted to and users to duplicate this instrument for use in evaluating videos with appropriate credit given to High Plains Intermountain Center for Agricultural Health and Safety (HI-CAHS), Education & Training Program, Bert P. Beaudin, Ph.D., Team Leader, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado.

Poor → Exceptional

1 2 3 4 5 **10. Integration into the Learning Environment**
Can the video be easily integrated into the learning environment by adding emphasis to or supplementing more traditional methods? Did the video bring remote experiences and places to the learner?
Comments: _____

Technical Production

1 2 3 4 5 **11. General Video Design Characteristics**
Was the video well planned, organized, and structured? Was the technology transparent and non-threatening to the learner? Did the video demonstrate its ability to transcend space and time? The camera can go where the learner cannot and the video is an excellent media for presenting information or demonstrations that are timely, however, care must be taken to prevent giving a false idea of reality.
Comments: _____

1 2 3 4 5 **12. Focused on Intended Content**
Did the video avoid content not related to the subject matter stated in the introduction? Digressions could lead to confusion and may be a waste of video time.
Comments: _____

1 2 3 4 5 **13. Visual Quality**
Is the camera looking at the scene from the learners' point of view? This is especially important when psychomotor skills are being taught. Did the scene changes appear to be appropriate? Were special effects used to enhance learning by drawing attention to specific attributes of what is being seen? Were varying types of camera shots, close-ups to long shots, used to provide variety in the video?
Comments: _____

1 2 3 4 5 **14. Audio Quality**
Was the vocabulary of the narration appropriate for the intended audience? Was the speed of the narration slow enough to be understood? Was the music fitting for the visual effects or audio narration? Were background noises used that were conducive to learning? Were sound effects used to add emphasis to the visual tract of a video to enhance learning?
Comments: _____

1 2 3 4 5 **15. Audio-Visual Relationship**
Was the audio-visual combined well? The audio and visual components should not contradict one another but complement each other. Were there a variety of differing types of sounds and visuals to attract and hold attention?
Comments: _____

Included Supplemental Materials

1 2 3 4 5 **16. Provided Introductory Information**
Did the included supplemental materials include the purpose and objectives of the video? Did the video accomplish what is stated in the supplemental materials?
Comments: _____

1 2 3 4 5 **17. Clarifies and Summarizes Content**
Were job aids or diagrams provided to help in understanding the material? Were terms defined? Were sources for further investigation included? Are there suggested activities in the materials to aid in understanding? Such as, discussion questions, role plays or simulation exercises. Is the summary useful in understanding the nature of the video and does it match what is on the tape?
Comments: _____

_____ **Total** (Sum the Scores, 85 Max.)

Additional Comments:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE